DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 963 FL 001 992

AUTHOR	Lange, Dale L.; Hammers, James
TITLE	EPDA Institute in German for Cooperating Teachers and Teacher Trainers: Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	70
GRANT	OEG-0-9-331673-1843-725
NOTE	70p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.60
DESCRIPTORS	Cooperating Teachers, Educational Objectives, *German, *Institutes (Training Programs), Language Instruction, Methods Courses, Modern Languages, *Program Descriptions, Program Planning, Secondary Education, *Secondary School Teachers, Student Teachers, Summer Programs, Teacher Education, *Teacher Educator Education, Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This comprehensive report, prepared by program participants and staff, reviews the objectives of the institute and discusses problems common to student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university staff in the development of student-teacher programs. The operation of the institute is described, including: (1) planning, (2) description of institute participants and staff, (3) administration, and (4) evaluation. A sample brochure, letters by the director, and a profile of individual participants are included. The appendix contains a sample schedule, an evaluation of the German pilot program in terms of the program objectives, a contrastive commentary on commuter and resident institutes, and an attitudinal survey questionnaire administered to the participants. (RL)

ED044963

FINAL REPORT ON THE EPDA INSTITUTE IN GERMAN FOR:

COOPERATING TEACHERS AND TEACHER TRAINERS

AT: THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

DATES: AUGUST 11, 1969 TO JUNE 15, 1970

SUBMITTED BY: Dale L. Lange and James Hammers
(Director and Staff Member)

CONTRACT NO.: OEG-0-9-331673-1843-725

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FL001992

ED044963

INTRODUCTION

During the school year 1969-70 a most successful EPDA Institute in German for cooperating teachers and teacher trainers was held under the directorship of Dr. Dale Lange, Ph.D. at the University of Minnesota. This is the report of the results as evaluated by the participants and the staff.

The specific objectives of this Institute as stated in the proposal were:

1. Upgrade the in-service teacher in all areas measured by the MLA Test for Advanced Students and Teachers.
2. Improve the classroom teacher's attitude toward teacher training and his own role in teacher education.
3. Improve cooperation between the university and the secondary school and particularly team planning of the teacher education program.
4. Improve the undergraduate foreign language teacher education program.
5. Upgrade the status of the supervising teacher by recognizing his special role.
6. Develop leadership qualities among classroom teachers to make them better supervising teachers, department chairmen and professional leaders.
7. Provide special help to the foreign language teacher in unique areas in which he presently lacks experience (i.e., teaching literature, teaching social studies materials through foreign language, unit teaching) which he in turn can pass along to his student teachers.

The need for such an institute in the Twin City area was very great. The University of Minnesota certifies about

seventy language teachers each year. One of the most crucial aspects of the teacher training program is the student teaching experience. It is during this short but concentrated experience that the aspiring teaching is expected to develop those teaching skills which will demonstrate to the university supervisor and to the cooperating teacher that he can teach effectively and should be admitted to the profession. Unfortunately here, as is typical across the nation, the chances of the student teacher adequately getting the assistance and guidance he heeds to acquire these teaching skills are not good. Too many of the classroom teachers who are asked to accept a student teacher have themselves not kept their teaching current and are unaware of what the profession considers effective teaching. All too often the proficiency in the language skills they are supposedly teaching is found wanting. But one of the most serious deficiencies found among cooperating teachers is that all too often the teacher is unaware of the importance of his role in the professional formation of the student teacher. Most sincerely want to help but don't know how to carry out their role. Thus the cooperating teacher, more often than not, more out of ignorance than out of malice sabotages the student teaching program.

Much of this ignorance can be traced to the university program itself. Communications and relations between the university and the secondary schools are in most cases almost nonexistent. Consequently the cooperating teacher has practically no idea of what the university expects or wants from him. The cooperating teacher is not called upon to help plan the student teaching program. He has little or no chance to check the qualifications of the student teacher much less choose whom he will supervise. His voice in the matter is stilled after he agrees to take a student teacher. Although the cooperating teacher has the most opportunity to observe and evaluate the performance of the student teacher, he is not asked to submit the grade. At best he may be consulted by the university supervisor.

There exists, therefore, besides the personal needs of the teacher, a tremendous need for better communications between the cooperating teacher and the university for the inclusion of the cooperating teacher in the planning, execution and evaluation of student teaching programs for developing master teachers who know their role and are interested in keeping themselves proficient so that they can assist the proficiencies of the novice teacher. It was with these needs in mind that the above objectives were formulated and the institute held.

Operation of the Program

1. Planning

The program was executed as planned without any significant modifications. There was a two week pre-school workshop from August 11 to June 11, 1969. The institute met also every other Saturday during the year for a total of 18 meetings. The one modification in the schedule was that instead of a two day seminar in undergraduate teaching and methods the participants spent approximately four evenings in group meetings to cooperatively develop a handbook on student teaching.

This schedule met with the enthusiastic approval of the participants. The two week session in the summer was just long enough to allow the participants to get acquainted and to orientate themselves and the staff to the hoped for outcomes and to the program of the institute. During these two weeks a most friendly, informal atmosphere and a feeling of solidarity with a healthy tolerance of personal differences developed which did not suffer the decline characteristic of longer intensive summer programs. By spacing out the remaining meetings over the year, approximately one every other Saturday this solidarity and informality continued to grow while the participants became ever more

involved in heated discussions and imaginative projects. Some of the participants had attended other institutes lasting over the summer and all indicated they much preferred the schedule of this institute.

The only suggestions for a change in the scheduling was for meetings on Fridays or some other day on which they could be released from their schools. They felt that teaching five days and then attending an all day session of the institute made a rather long six day week. In spite of this, however, and in spite of the fact that some had to drive as far as eighty miles to attend the first class at eight o'clock a.m., there was no absenteeism during the entire year, an indication of the value the participants placed on attending the institute.

The greatest advantage of the schedule as expressed by the participants was that they could go back to their classrooms between discussions and try out the conclusions and ideas brought forth in the exchange of ideas. Invariably as they tried out new ideas, new materials and new techniques more ideas occured to them which they could add to the discussion of the next meeting or new problems would arise which they brought up for consideration. The result was to get more and more involved in the problems of teaching and

supervising so that when the institute was over in June it spelled the beginning th new ventures in these areas.

The institute was also fortunate in having a staff that related most harmoniously with the participants. Each staff member strove to encourage initiative, experimentation, discussion and freedom for the individuality and the particular interests of the participants. The attitute was one of equals engaged in a common cause. Every participant felt every bit as free to offer suggestions and contribute to the deliberations as did the faculty. Discussion began among participants before the sessions began, continued through the noon hour and groups could be observed still heatedly engaged as they walked to the parking lots at 3:30 p.m.

At no time was the institute cramped for space nor found deficient in materials and equipment. The institute had the exclusive use of at least one classroom during the morning sessions and two for the afternoon sessions on all the days that the institute met in Peik Hall. Duplicating machines, copiers, typewriters, projectors of all kinds were readily made available by the University.

2. Participants

To advertise the institute, brochures were sent to all the colleges and all language teachers in a 75 mile radius of the Twin Cities. The response was overwhelming with inquiries arriving from as far away as Florida. Those who would not be able to drive regularly for the Saturday sessions had to be eliminated on the grounds of distance. But it was gratifying to see how far spread the need for such an institute was felt. The selection of participants from among in-state applicants was guided by the following criterion:

1. The selectee must be willing to supervise student teachers throughout the school year.
2. First preference would go to teachers who had not attended an institute and/or who were unlikely to be able to attend one.
3. Those selected should have shown leadership or exhibited leadership potential.
4. A minimum of two years teaching experience would be required.
5. Strong evidence had to be available that indicated that the selectee would continue in teacher training for an extended period of time.

Based on these criterion a committee selected 30 applications, 6 teacher trainers and 24 secondary teachers for further consideration. From these the final 14, 4 teacher trainers and 10 secondary teachers, were selected.

Those selected represented a wide range of institutions and schools. Two of the teacher trainers came from private

colleges while the other two came from state institutions. The ten secondary teachers represented public schools from urban, suburban and rural areas. The professional and experiential mix was calculated to generate as much exchange among the participants and with the staff as possible. As has been already indicated this expectation was met beyond the minimum.

3. Staff

The staff was also chosen because of the mixed qualifications and mixed backgrounds represented. Dr. Jermaine Arendt is Foreign Language Consultant for the Minneapolis Public Schools. Mark Goodman is a resource teacher in audio-visual aids for the Minneapolis Public Schools. Dr. Eugene Anderson was and is the assistant director of clinical experiences at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Dale L. Lange, the director, is a professor in the department of secondary education at the University of Minnesota. Mr. Donald Steinmetz is currently a lecturer in German at Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Mr. James Hammers is a graduate student at the University of Minnesota but had been actively engaged in teacher training and supervision for three years at St. Benedict's College in St. Joseph, Minnesota.

Besides this regular staff the institute was fortunate to engage the services of the following well-known lecturers and consultants: Dr. John B. Carroll, Ph.D., former Professor of Educational Psychology and presently with the Educational Testing Service. He lead a most interesting and informative discussion on student variables in learning and modern language methodology. Dr. Richard Tucker, Professor of Psychology, McGill University, Canada who stimulated thought and discussion on motivation in language teaching and learning. Percy Fearing, Foreign Language Consultant for the state of Minnesota, spent considerable time with the participants, discussing with them problems in the foreign language curriculum in the state of Minnesota. He asked the participants for their suggestions for a stronger program in Minnesota which resulted in new state guidelines on teacher certification in foreign languages. Mr. Donald Ryberg led a morning's discussion on the innovative language programs being taught at Marshall-University High School and on other programs being planned.

Unfortunately others who were asked could not come or were prevented from coming because the finances of the institute could not cover their honorarium.

The impact of these visiting lecturers was very great. Many of the participants prepared for these visits by reading articles on the specific topics of the lectures. They were surprised and pleased to observe how readily accessible these men are and how willing they are to talk to teachers about education and the problems in the classroom.

4. Program operation

The main hope for achieving the objectives of the institute lay naturally in the discussions and projects of the basic courses. Four courses were offered during the two week pre-school session of which three were continued throughout the year.

4.1 Practicum - Problems of Teaching

The first course taught every morning at 8:00 a.m. during the institute was intended to deal with the teaching skills involved in language instruction at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels. Dr. Lange led the discussions often assisted by Dr. Anderson. The intent was to involve the participants in analyzing the teaching act and judging which teaching is most effective, with which students, and at which most opportune times. Behavioral objectives

were discussed, a systems approach applied to teaching foreign languages and an attempt was made to identify the separate components of the teaching act. In this regard the concept of micro-teaching was introduced and the staff and participants tried to identify which elements of foreign language teaching would constitute a single teaching act which could become a micro-teaching unit. If the participants could understand more fully what is involved in teaching the hope was that they would be able to strengthen their effectiveness in the classroom, and be of greater assistance to student teachers who might come to them. That the participants taught for approximately two weeks between sessions gave them ample time to digest what was discussed, to experiment with new ideas together with the student teacher assigned to them and to discover new problems to bring up at the next session or to report gratifying results. The discussions often became so intense that the group broke up only reluctantly for the coffee break at 9:30 a.m.

4.2 Supervision of Instruction

After the coffee break at 10:00 a.m. three times a week during the two week session and every Saturday when

the institute was in session, Drs. Lange and Anderson switched the discussion to the problems of supervising student teaching. It was in this session that the professional mix was put to best advantage. The teacher trainers thought of the problems involved in being the college or university supervisor. The secondary school teachers thought of the problems involved in having a student teacher. For each to hear the others views and for both to discuss their problems greatly enhanced the understanding each had of the other. The college personnel realized the importance of involving the secondary school teachers in the planning, execution and evaluation of the student teaching program. The secondary school teachers became more aware of the importance of their role in the training of new teachers and also of the things they could and should do to make the student teaching experience a more worthwhile one. Each of the participants from secondary school in the Twin City area had at least one student teacher from the University. Some had student teachers from other area colleges. Those from the rural area had student teachers from their neighboring colleges. One of the teacher trainers in the institute was from this area and could supervise when the student teacher was from

her college. Two of the other teacher trainers were also actively engaged in supervising student teachers from their institutions during the institute, sometimes with secondary school participants from the institute. In many direct and indirect ways, then, the effects of the institute spread into colleges and secondary schools far beyond those represented by the institute participants. This far reaching effect is one of the great strengths of a successful institute.

Again the combination of discussion on Saturday with at least two weeks in which to digest, experiment and observe results led to greater involvment on the part of all and to livelier discussions, more penetrating observations and more constructive suggestions than could have been possible with an institute where all the discussion precedes any action. Some of the innovations tried by most of the participants was an orientation program for the student teacher to acquaint him with the school, the personnel, the community and the curriculum of the school in which the student would do his student teaching and a modified micro-teaching approach wherein the student teacher was instructed to try specific, short tasks with a group before an entire class was handed over to him.

Specific objectives for the student teaching experience were decided upon by the teacher, the supervisor and the student. Both the college supervisor and the classroom teacher evaluated both the student teacher's performance and the effectiveness of the program.

4.3 Using Audio-Visual Aids - Lab

The Audio-Visual course met twice a week during the summer session at 10:00 a.m. and every Saturday at 1:00 p.m. during the year. During the summer session Mr. Goodman and Dr. Arendt introduced the participants to a great variety of technological aids and materials which could be useful in the foreign language classroom. The original assumption was that participants had probably used media to varying degrees and in different ways, but that they could all benefit from an in-depth study of media in instructional systems.

The two major objectives for the Technological Media course were:

1. Develop guidelines for working with student teachers in choosing and using media.
2. Improve the use of media by the cooperating teacher and methods teacher.

The Technological Media team decided that participants accomplish the goals in the following ways:

1. Cooperating teachers provide orientation to their school's media center for each student teacher assigned.

   a. The student teacher learns what equipment is available.

   b. The student teacher learns the procedures for ordering equipment and materials.

   c. The student teacher learns how to operate the equipment.

   d. The student learns how to produce materials.

2. The cooperating teacher and methods teacher encourage the student teacher to use a wide variety of print and nonprint materials to solve instructional problems.

3. The cooperating teacher and methods teacher help the student teacher understand the new role of the teacher as a manager of learning.

Tangible evidence of carrying out these objectives was to be a development of a unit of instruction. To update the participants' knowledge of the developments and possibilities in the use of media in foreign language teaching, several sessions were held wherein a large display of equipment was featured. The participants were invited to discuss

their possible use, to acquaint themselves with their operation and even to produce some materials they thought would be useful in the classroom. Time was spent on the use of systems analysis for planning a unit. Behavioral objectives were written and texts and other company produced materials were studied, analyzed and criticized.

Particiapnts then prepared units of instruction utilizing a variety of media and techniques of instruction. The following partial list indicates the wide diversity of the projects.

1. A Unit on Animals for Elementary School Children. Included taped music, transparencies and work sheets. It was developed by a methods teacher and her students.
2. A Slide-tape Unit on Duesseldorf. This unit included over two hundred slides which could be viewed by individual students as part of a learning activity package. The unit will be submitted to the national Unipac library in Anaheim, California.
3. A series of 360 slides to be used for contextual drill exercies in an independent study laboratory.
4. An 8mm film on German Foods. This film was produced by a high school teacher and his students. It portrays eating out in a typical German restaurant.

Judging from the originality of the work done, from the enthusiasm with which the participants worked on their projects and even helped each other out with materials and suggestions from their willingness to try out new techniques and materials, the teaching team for Technological Media judged their course most successful. The participants obviously considered the activities most valuable and expressed their support for this and the other courses when interviewed by Mr. Grittner and in the questionnaire.

4.4 The Foreign Language: German

During the two week summer session Mr. Donald Steinmetz conducted a class on the German language. The class was conducted entirely in German and it was here that the language proficiencies of the participants became apparent. None had any difficulties carrying on extended discussions about grammatical points in German. Mr. Steinmetz concentrated on a transformational approach to German grammar. For many of the participants this was the first time they were exposed to the more recent linguistics thought and Mr. Steinmetz was able to generate a great deal of discussion not only about German grammar as such but also about the implications this approach to grammar could have

on language teaching. The unanimous request of Mr. Steinmetz at the end of the two weeks was that he return on some Saturdays and continue what he had started. He agreed but unfortunately the Saturday sessions were always so full of other matters that this request could never be fulfilled.

4.5 Student Teaching Supervision

Each participant as one of the criterion for acceptance to the institute had to agree to accept a student teacher during any quarter of the school year. It was possible during the course of the school year to place at least one student teacher from the University with each of the eight participants from the Twin City area. Three or four student teachers from the University were assigned to institute participants each quarter. It was thus possible for Mr. Hammers to work quite closely with three or four of the participants each quarter on the program of the student teacher. Having only three or four student teachers to supervise he could make frequent visits to the school. He also attended all the Saturday sessions and could thus help put into practice the ideas and suggestions made there. First he worked with the participants on developing specific objectives with and for the student teacher. Emphasis was placed upon making the student teacher part of the team who

would plan his program. Both student teachers and classroom teachers responded favorably to this approach. Then he tried to help develop a systematic and gradual program to get the student teacher involved in teaching until he could take the class along. Flander's interaction analysis was used to help the student teacher analyze his or her own teaching. The most difficult area for cooperation proved to be that of evaluation. As became clear from the morning discussions on Saturday a definition of good teaching is almost impossible to give or define and it is therefore very difficult to put a value judgement upon what a student teacher has been doing. Such things as student interest, student response and student achievement could be commented on in general, discussion could be carried on about how well the student teacher and the cooperating teacher felt the objectives decided upon at the beginning of the experience had been met but so much is involved in teaching and so few things are even possible during the short student teaching experience that it was very difficult to decide if the performance observed during that time was a true representation of the true abilities or the potential of the candidate. The most valuable part of the experience for both the supervisor and the classroom teacher, however, was

the opportunity to duscuss together what should or should not be done. The teachers appreciated the opportunity, also, to air their gripes about the University program and they seemed to feel that their influence could effect change. That changes are being made in the University program indicated that their concern was not in vain. The student-teachers also indicated their appreciation for being made a part of the planning and evaluation as far as it went of their own program. It made them feel more a part of the profession, like a teacher and less like a student.

5. Evaluation

Various evaluation measure had been mentioned in the proposal. As the program developed it became obvious that some measures did not apply and time prevented others from being utilized. Two evaluation techniques were used. A questionnaire was developed which attempted to determine the satisfaction of the participants with the outcomes of the institute. Mr. Frank Grittner, State Supervisor of Foreign Languages for Wisconsin was also asked to visit the institute and to submit an evaluation of it. The results of the two are so consistent in their findings that further evaluation measure would be superfluous.

The questionnaire used Osgood's 25 pairs of adjectives. Each pair opposes a negative adjective with its positive opposite. Between each pair are seven spaces. The participant was to indicate how far toward the positive or negative side of these two poles he would rate the institute with regard to the question asked. In evaluating the results a numerical value was assigned each response to each adjective pair. The spaces between the adjectives were numbered 1 through 7 with 1 being most negative and 7 being most positive. The number 4 thus assumed a neutral role between the two extremes, the further toward 1 the more negative the response. The ten questions were:

1. Did the institute provide an up-grading of language skills?
2. Did the institute change your attitides positively-negatively (circle one) toward teacher training?
3. Did the institute change your attitude positively-negatively (circle one) toward your role in teacher education?
4. Did the institute provide an atmosphere where the university and secondary school people could together plan for changes in teacher education?
5. For those who worked with the University of Minnesota, did the institute have a positive-negative (circle one)

impact on the FL teacher education program?

6. For those who are cooperating teachers, did the institute contribute in a positive-negative (circle one) way in your role as a cooperating teacher?

7. Did the institute contribute to the development of "leadership" qualities in participants?

8. Did the institute provide help in areas of teaching which could be passed on to student teachers?

9. Did the institute obtain its overall objective?:

> "The overall objective of this institute is to develop a model classroom teacher-college relationship which will give the classroom teacher an important place as a co-professional in planning foreign language teacher training programs and in carrying out his very important function as cooperating teacher in the student teaching program."

10. For those who are teacher trainers, did the institute provide positive-negative (circle one) stimuli which will be helpful in the further development of theppro-gram of FL teacher education in your own institution?

The following table shows the results:

Question No.	No. Responding	Average Response
1	12 of possible 14	5.4
2	12 of possible 14	5.6
3	12 of possible 14	5.5
4	12 of possible 14	5.85
5	4 of possible 8	4.7
6	8 of possible 10	5.5
7	12 of possible 14	5.4
8	12 of possible 14	5.7
9	12 of possible 14	5.8
10	4 of possible 4	5.9

As can be seen, the responses are consistently positive. In every instance where either "positive" or "negative" was to be circled, the word "positive" was circled. The average response for those questions answered by all twelve respondents is 5.6. The most positive response was made to question four, concerning the objective of providing an atmosphere of cooperation between the University and secondary school.

The other evaluation came from Mr. Frank Grittner. He used the "Critical Incident Technique" - explained more fully in his report - classroom observation and group and individual interviews. He found the participants enthusiastic about the institute. They felt that the objectives were being met very well. He arranged the summary of his evaluation according to the stated objectives of the institute. For objectives one through six the report states that each objective has been realized beyond expectation. Quotes from the participants are included under many of the objectives to substantiate this conclusion. A sampling of these are: (for objective one) "The work with interaction analysis made me aware that I was doing too much of the talking and not allowing the students to use the language as much as they should; I changed my way of teaching as a result." "The work with techniques of individualizing

instruction carried over directly to my work with my own pupils; I am doing a great deal more work with individualized instruction." Under objective four some of the positive results of the institute are listed.

1. The development of an instrument describing minimal performance standards for foreign language teacher trainees;
2. The modification of the university of Minnesota foreign language teacher education program on the basis of institute recommendations developed by staff and participants;
3. The creation of an urban and suburban center based upon the foreign language institute model including the Robbinsdale Public Schools and the Minneapolis Public Schools.

The only dissatisfaction with the realization of objectives was found with objective seven, which was to "provide special help to the foreign language teacher in unique areas in which he presently lacked experience (i.e., teaching literature, teaching social studies materials for the foreign language, unit teaching) which he in turn can pass along to his student teacher." The program was too full to really attend to this objective and the participants felt that this was the most expendable of the seven goals. Indirectly however the participants were provided with help through the multi-media projects they did, through Mr. Steinmetz's lectures and through the exchange of ideas and materials among the participants.

Brittner's summary statement about the institute reads, "In the opinion of this evaluator, the institute described in this report is exemplary. With a few minor adjustments in format, it could well become the model for restructuring inservice and preservice education for foriegn language teachers in the schools of America."

The MLA-ETS Teacher Qualifications Battery pre and post tests were not administered nor was the Cooperating Teachers' Attitude Questionnaire. The proficiency tests did not really apply since so little of the institute dealth directly with speaking skills and thus could affect little change. The CTAQ was dropped for lack of time and because it would have duplicated much of what was accomplished by the questionnaire given all the participants.

CONCLUSIONS

The institute was a tremendous success for all involved. The communications between the college or university supervisor, the classroom cooperating teacher and the student teacher have been greatly strengthened. Particularly the classroom cooperating teachers in the institute have gained a new appreciation of their role in the training of teachers and have learned new ways of being of greater assistance to

the student teacher. The University has responded to the outcomes of the institute by including more courses in language, culture and linguistics in the undergraduate program. Greater cooperation has been achieved between the college of education and the cooperating teachers on the secondary school level. Student teachers will be given three choices for student teaching assignments; a one quarter all day off-campus assignment in either suburban or urban centers, a one quarter all-day on campus assignment at the University high school or Robbinsdale, or two quarters of part-day assignments off and on campus. A methods course will be offered for student teachers who want to teach in the elementary schools. A course is also being planned for the fall of 1970 for cooperating teachers in foreign languages. Even the State Department of Education will be issuing new guidelines on certification of teachers in foreign languages as a result of discussions with institute participants.

The successes of this institute suggest that many more institutes of this nature should be instituted in various parts of the country. Similar needs for communication among the various parties in the college and secondary school systems involved in training and certifying student teachers

exist everywhere. If cooperating teachers, teacher trainers, and university and college supervisors can meet regularly over a year to study together, to discuss their problems, their hopes and their suggestions for improvement, to try out and report on new or improved techniques comparable results can be expected which can only strengthen the teacher training programs throughout the country and consequently improve the condition of education everywhere in the country.

APPENDIX B

LETTERS

(answer to letter of inquiry)

Dear_____:

Thank you for your inquiry about the EPDA Institute for Cooperating Teacher in German to be held at the University of Minnesota for two weeks this summer and on 18 Saturdays throughout the academic year 1969-70.

This program as you may have already surmised is a local program, limited to the area of the Minneapolis and St. Paul area. It is a pilot project for 10 German teachers and 4 teacher trainers, which builds its academic year program on the two week experience. All participants must carry a student teacher throughout the year. Since you may be too fary away from the area, it is my opinion that it would be too difficult for you to participate. Therefore, I am not sending you either brochures or application forms.

Perhaps there are other EPDA Institutes which may satisfy your needs. Thank you again for your interest in the institute.

Sincerely,

Dale L. Lange
Director, EPDA Institute for
Cooperating Teachers and
Teacher Trainers in German
152-A Peik Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

(answer to a letter of inquiry)

Dear _____:

Thank you for your interest in the EPDA Institute for 10 cooperating teach ers of German and 4 teacher trainers.

The Institute Brochure and application forms will be ready shortly and will be sent to you automatically.

Thank you for being patient. The newness of EPDA has caused some delay.

Sincerely,

Dale L. Lange
Director, EPDA Institute for
Cooperating Teachers and
Teacher Trainers in German
152-A Peik Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

(letter to selectee)

April 18, 1969

Dear_____:

Congratulations! You have been selected as a participant in the University of Minnesota EPDA Institute in German for Cooperating Teachers and Teacher Trainers. We had 2.5 applications for every position available making the competition keen. The committee making the recommendations worked very diligently to make the difficult decisions.

If you plan to accept as a participant in this program, a letter of acceptance written to me must be postmarked no late than April 28, 1969. In addition, an application for stipend will be sent to you in time to meet the same deadline. I have not as yet received this form from the Office of Education, but it will be forthcoming. If your letter of acceptance is not recieved, your name will be dropped as an enrollee on May 9, 1969 and a replacement will be selected from the alternate candidates.

The work of this Institute will start on August 11, 1969. We will have an intensive two week experience which we hope will set the tone for the sessions to be held during the academic year 1969-70.

We hope that you will come during that time prepared to participate fully in the program.

Again thank you for your interest in the Institute. You will be hearing from me before the school year is out regarding other matters pertaining to Institute business. If you have any questions, please contact me either by phone or letter.

Sincerely,

Dale L. Lange
Director, EPDA Institute for
Cooperating Teachers and
Teacher Trainers in German
152-A Peik Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

(letter to alternate)

April 18, 1969

Dear_____:

You have been chosen as an alternate for the EPDA Institute in German for Cooperating Teachers and Teacher Trainers to be held at the University of Minnesota August 11 through August 22, 1969 and 18 sessions during the academic year, 1969. If an opening permits us to invite you as a participant, we shall let you know at the earliest possible moment.

We regret that we are unable to give you more favorable consideration at this time. We recieved many more applications than the 14 positions we had available. Many things were taken into consideration and we had to pay particular attention to the needs of the applicants. If you are chosen later to participate in the Institute, we will send you more information. Thank you again for your interest. I hope that we may yet be able to ask you to join us.

Sincerely,

Dale L. Lange
Director, EPDA Institute for
Cooperating Teachers and
Teacher Trainers in German
152-A Peik Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

(letter to applicants not selected)

April 18, 1969

Dear _____:

We regret to inform you that we are unable to include you among the participants of our EPDA Institute in German for Cooperating Teachers and Teacher Trainers to be held at the University of Minnesota. The reasons for not having been able to accept all applicants are numerous and complex. The committee making the recommendations worked diligently to make the difficult decisions. It is possible to give you only the most obvious reasons for our actions.

Firstly, we received many more applications than we had positions available. Secondarly, we had to limit the number of participants to 10 cooperating teachers and 4 teacher trainers. Thirdly, we wanted to include more people who had not previously attended institutes than those who had.

Again, I would like to thank you for your interest. We hope that such an Institute will be offered again and urge you to reapply.

Sincerely,

Dale L. Lange
Director, EPDA Institute for
Cooperating Teachers and
Teacher Trainers in German
152-A Peik Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

(follow-up letter to participants)

TO: EPDA INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS
FROM: DALE L. LANGE
SUBJECT: INSTITUTE CREDITS AND REGISTRATION
DATE: May 16, 1969

We are going to be able to offer 9 Graduate Credits for the Institute. In order for us to be able to pre-register you and to obtain Graduate credit for you, if you want and need it, we need to know some information from you. Would you please check the enclosed sheet and answer the questions asked of you?

As indicated above, we will preregister you for the Institute, so you will not have to stand in long lines as other students have to do. The information on the enclosed sheet is important for us to have in order to preregister you. Please return it by May 23, 1969.

In preparation for the program, especially Ed.C.I. 185, I suggest you begin reading the following materials:

1. Rivers, Wilga. Teaching Foreign Language Skills. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

2. Valette, Rebecca. Modern Language Testing. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967.

In addition:

3. Politzer, Robert. Teaching German: A Linguistic Orientation. Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1968.

4. Kufner, Herbert L. The Grammatical Structures of English and German. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

5. Moulton, William G. The Sounds of English and German. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

The first items are generally available at Perines Book Company, 315 14th Avenue S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414, since we use them in our undergraduate methods courses. The others are most likely in either the school library or your own private collection.

From time to time as the spirit moves and as the need arises, I shall have further contact with you. Should you have any questions about this or other Institute matters, please contact me at 373-7992, I'm usually in my office after 1:30 p.m.

Name:_____

Check the appropriate boxes.

1. I am already enrolled in the Graduate School at the University of Minnesota.

   I am not enrolled in the Graduate School at the University of Minnesota.

2. I must have Graduate credit because I am working on a Graduate program at the University of Minnesota.

   I do not need Graduate credit for a graduate program.

3. I need Graduate credit to help me move up the pay scale in my school.

   I need the credits to move up the pay scale in my school, but I need not be registered as a graduate student for them to count.

4. I must be registered for the Institute program as a Graduate Student

   I can be registered for the Institute program as an Adult Special

5. The following are the Institute courses. Check the courses for which you want credit.

   A. Ed.C.I. 185A Practicum/Seminar on the Problems of Teaching German
   B. Ed.C.I. 185B Supervision of Foreign Language Student Teachers
   C. Ed.C.I. 185C Using Technological Media and other aids in Foreign Language Instruction.

6. If you are not now registered as a graduate student at the University of Minnesota and you want to work for an advanced degree here, do you intend to apply for admission to the Graduate School in order to receive graduate credit?

   If so you must do so immediately!!!

If you have been a student at the University of Minnesota at any time please give your file no._____
If you have been or are a student in the Graduate School please give your Graduate School No._____

APPENDIX C
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

NAME & SCHOOL ADDRESS	HOME ADDRESS
Patricia B. Bastian Plymouth Jr. High Robbinsdale, Minn.	1283 Brighton Square New Brighton, Minn. 55112
Barbara J. Bloomer St. Cloud State College St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301	1601 8th Avenue SE St. Cloud Minnesota 56301
Donald L. Ehrlichmann Henry High School 2020 43rd Avenue North Mpls., Minn. 55412	3614 Thomas Avenue North Minneapolis Minnesota 55412
Gerald E. Eibner John Metcalf Jr. High Burnsville, Minn. 55378	228 Strese Lane Rosemount, Minn. 55068
Le Roy Elsing Murray High School 1450 Grantham Ave. St. Paul, Minn. 55108	1517 Chelmsford Street St. Paul, Mn. 55108
Wallace G. Esgate Mankato State College Mankato, Mn. 56001	437 Moreland Ave. Mankato, Mn. 56001
Arthur J. Maethner Independent School District No. 742 St. Cloud, Mn. 56301	169 Riverside Drive NE St. Cloud, Mn. 56301
LeRoy N. Pauley Independent School Dist. No. 743 St. Cloud, Mn. 56301	1027-14th Ave. South St. Cloud, Mn. 56301
Carol Ann Pesola St. Olaf College Northfield, Minn.	203 Manitou Northfield, Minn. 55057
Katharine Raynolds North St. Paul-Maplewood Schools	912 18th Ave. SE Mpls., Minn. 55414
David Rykken Coon Rapids Sr. High	12001 Zion St. NW Coon Rapids, Minn. 55433

Theodor K. Seidel
Burnsville Sr. High

1317 Hillside Lane
Burnsville, Mn. 55378

Heidi Waitschies
Bethel College
St. Paul, Mn. 55101

1697 N. Fry #6
St. Paul, Mn. 55113

Margaret Zabel
Hopkins Sr. High

625 Robinwood Lane
Hopkins, Mn. 55343

A P P E N D I X D

A. Director

Dale L. Lange, B.S., M.A., Ph.D., University of Minnesota

B. Teaching Staff - Part-time

1. Jermaine D. Arendt, B.S., M.A., Ph.D. (University of Minnesota) Foreign language consultant, Minneapolis Schools.

2. Eugene Anderson. Student Teacher Coordinator for Secondary (University of Minnesota).

3. Donald Steinmetz, M.A. (University of Minnesota). Lecturer in German.

4. Mark Goodman, M.A. (University of Minnesota). A-V Resource Teacher, Minneapolis Schools.

5. James Hammers, M.A. (University of Minnesota). University Student-Teacher Supervisor.

6. Charles James and Carl Spangler, Graduate Assistants.

C. Special Lecturers and Consultants

1. Politzer, Robert, Ph.D. (Columbia University). Professor of Modern Language Education, Stanford University. Professor Politzer will demonstrate micro-teaching and video-taping techniques as used in teacher preparation.

2. Carroll, John B., Ph.D. (University of Minnesota). Former Professor of Educational Psychology and presently with the Educational Testing Service. Dr. Carroll will lecture on the implication of cognitive learning theory for foreign language teaching.

3. Tucker, G. Richard, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology, McGill University, Canada. Dr. Tucker will lecture on the research concerning students' attitudes toward other cultures as well as the role of motivation in success in language learning.

4. Weiss, Gerhard, Ph.D. (University of Minnesota). Professor of German and Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota. Professor Weiss will speak to the Institute on the teaching of culture and literature advanced levels.

5. Fearing, Percy, M.A. (University of Minnesota), State Foreign Language Consultant, will provide continuing consultation throughout the institute and will provide this consultative role in the form of lectures and demonstrations for two courses in the program: Practicum in Methodology and Supervision of Student Teaching.

6. Moskowitz, Gertrude, Ed.D. (Temple University). Assistant Professor of Education and Coordinator of Foreign Language Teacher Education Program, Temple University. Developer of FLINT (Foreign Language Interaction), an instrument for observing interaction in foreign language classes. Author of the Foreign Language Teacher Interacts, a programmed text, tapes and manual for training foreign language teachers in interaction analysis.

7. Smith, Al, Ph.D. (Ohio State University). Assistant Professor of Foreign Language Education. Professor Smith will lecture on developmental reading.

8. Ryberg, Donald, M.A. (University of Minnesota), Modern Language Coordinator, Marshall University High School.

APPENDIX E

S A M P L E S C H E D U L E

T W O W E E K P R E-S C H O O L W O R K S H O P

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
8:00-9:30	Practicum Problems of Teaching	----------	----------	----------	----------
9:30-10:00	Coffee Break	----------	----------	----------	----------
10:00-11:30	Supervision of Student Teachers	Using A - V Aids, Seminar, Lab	Supervision of Student Teachers	Using A - V Aids Seminar, Lab	Supervision of Student Teachers
11:30-12:30	Lunch	----------	----------	----------	----------
12:30-1:30	Advanced Language Practice	----------	----------	----------	----------

S A M P L E S C H E D U L E

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
1:30-2:30					
2:30-3:30	Special Program or Preview of FL Films	Conference and Ind. Study			

SATURDAY SESSIONS

8:00 - 9:30	Practicum Problems of Teaching
9:30 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 11:30	Supervison of FL Instruction
11:30 - 12:30	Lunch
12:30- 3:30	Program Seminar Special Programs Special Problems Conferences

APPENDIX

EVALUATION OF GERMAN PILOT PROGRAM

Educational Personnel Development Grant
Dale Lange, Director
University of Minnesota
225 Peik Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Evaluation conducted
Saturday, May 9, 1970 by

Frank M. Grittner
State Supervisor of Foreign Languages
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
126 Langdon
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Introduction

On Saturday, May 9, 1970 Grank Grittner, State Foreign Language Supervisor of Wisconsin, conducted an evaluation of the pilot program. Evaluative techniques included the following:

1. The use of the "Critical Incident Technique" (Flanagan, John C., "The Critical Incident Technique," Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 51 (July, 1954), pp. 327-358.);
2. Classroom observations of each of the project components carried on during the day of the visit; and
3. Interviews with all participants conducted first in groups of four and at the end of the day with the total group.

The Critical Incident Technique, as used during this evaluation, involved asking the participants to write a brief commentary on (1) the one aspect of the institute that they liked best and (2) the one aspect of the institute which they found most frustrating. The observation of institute activities and the questioning of staff and participants was so designed as to elicit remarks or to observe behaviors which related to the seven program objectives. These objectives, which were drawn from the proposal for the EPDA grant, were as follows:

1. Upgrade the inservice teacher in all areas.
2. Improve the classroom teacher's attitude toward teacher training and to his own role in teacher education.
3. Improve cooperation between the university and the secondary school and particularly team planning of the teacher education program.
4. Improve the undergraduate foreign language teacher education program.
5. Upgrade the status of the supervising teacher by recognizing his special role.

6. Develop leadership qualities among classroom teachers to make them better supervising teachers, department chairmen and professional leaders.
7. Provide special help to the foreign language teacher in unique areas in which he presently lacks experience (i.e., teaching literature, teaching social studies materials through foreign language, unit teaching) which he in turn can pass along to his student teachers.

In the course of interviewing the participants, it was discovered that all but one of the persons interviewed had attended at least one NDEA summer institute. This made it possible to ask questions and elicit responses relating to the relative merits of the intensive summer program vs. the pilot commuter institute which was under evaluation. The results of the evaluation are summarized below.

Evaluation of the Institute Objectives

Objective #1: Upgrade the inservice teacher in all areas. During the course of the interview eight of the ten cooperating high school teachers were asked to cite one specific example of how the institute had carried over in such a way as to improve their classroom teaching. Each teacher expressed the opinion that the institute had been tremendously helpful and volunteered to give many examples. However, interview time did not permit a long discussion so each participant was held to one response. The eight items below give evidence of a wide range of values derived from attending the institute program:

1. The work with behavioral objectives helped me greatly to better define my course objectives in the German class;
2. The work with interaction analysis made me aware that I was doing too much of the talking and not allowing

the students to use the language as much as they should; I changed my way of teaching as a result;

3. The Steinmetz lectures (which were conducted in German and which related to the use of structural grammar in the classroom) were both enlightening and useful; much of my subsequent classroom work was improved by applying the principles learned from these lectures;
4. The work with foreign language evaluation led me to devise greatly improved test questions which in turn improved the local instructional program;
5. The "unipac" which I developed on the weather using the overhead projector and other audio-visual devices was a successful addition to my classroom teaching procedures;
6. I developed a series of overhead transparencies which added variety and which improved the effectiveness of my teaching German verbs;
7. The work with techniques of individualizing instruction carried over directly to my work with my own pupils; I am doing a great deal more work with individualized instruction;
8. I had made very little use of audio-visual materials and equipment prior to the institute. I am now using them regularly and have learned how to prepare my own materials which are tailored to my own particular course and to the students in the local school district.

Objective #2: Improve the classroom teacher's attitude toward teacher training and to his own role in teacher education. All high school cooperating teachers in the institute program were emphatic in stating that this objective had been realized beyond their expectations. Many specific examples

were given, but time did not permit noting all of them. (See objective #3 and #4 below.)

Objective #3: Improve cooperation between the university and the secondary school and particularly team planning of the teacher education program. Again all participants were emphatic in stating that this objective had been met to their full expectations especially as it applied to the four teacher trainers and the ten cooperating teachers. It was the unanimous opinion of the participants that the interaction between these two groups had been extremely valuable for both.

Objective #4: Improve the undergraduate foreign language teacher education program. In addition to the general overall feeling that this had happened, staff members and participants gave the following six indications of specific developments which were attributable in whole or in part to the activities of the institute:

1. The developments of an instrument describing minimal performance standards for foreign language teacher trainees;
2. The modification of the University of Minnesota foreign language teacher education program on the basis of institute recommendations developed by staff and participants;
3. The creation of an urban and suburban center based upon the foreign language institute model including the Robbinsdale Public Schools and the Minneapolis Public Schools (also including schools in the center city). This insured the perpetuation of the institute idea for those teachers who wish to participate in the center;
4. The practice-centered approach to teacher training was actually put into effect in those school buildings

involving cooperating teachers who were enrolled in the institute;

5. All institute participants felt that foreign language teacher trainees profited greatly from the observation period (prior to their actual practice teaching) because of the improved observation techniques which were developed at the institute and which were used by the trainees;
6. The more carefully planned practice teacher model developed by institute participants led to a much better direction of teacher trainee activities during the practice teaching period (in the opinion of all participants).

Objective #5: Upgrade the status of the supervising teacher by recognizing his special role. Again all cooperating teachers interviewed were emphatic in saying that this objective had been met. Comments were similar to those given under objective #4 above. They are not repeated here because of their similarity.

Objective #6: Develop leadership qualities among classroom teachers to make them better supervising teachers, department chairmen and professional leaders. To get at this question each participant was asked to give examples of institute activities which carried over to other teachers in his local school or to other schools or to their relationship with professional organizations. A sampling of the responses obtained from this question were as follows:

1. One teacher cited the use of an attitude survey form to measure changes in students' attitude toward foreign peoples and foreign cultures. The teacher had been introduced to this form during the institute and had convinced all other language teachers in his school district that it would be a useful instrument;

2. Another participant (cooperating teacher) had spoken to an assembled group of all teachers in his school district about the need for the profession to move toward the use of interns rather than toward the existing practice teaching approach;
3. Another teacher cited tha fact that she had been asked to report to a regional language conference the ideas she had gained at the institute;
4. Another teacher mentioned the sharing of materials and ideas which had come of the institute activities;
5. And finally, another teacher had cited the fact that the institute program had given the impetus for an application to the local school board for a summer grant in the area of individualizing foreign language instruction; the grant was approved and funded by the school board.

Objective #7: Provide special help to the foreign language teacher in unique areas in which he presently lacks experience (i.e., teacher literature, teaching social studies materials through foreign language, unit teaching) which he in turn can pass along to his student teachers. The interviews and other data gathered during the visit indicated that this objective was the only one that was not adequately met by the institute activities. Only the unit teaching aspect of the objective appeared to have been fulfilled. (However, it should be noted here that all participants felt that there was a bit too much to do in the institute as it was. Obviously, something had to be slighted and it appears that this last objective was the most expendable.)

Advantages of the Commuter-Type Institute Vs. the Traditional Intensive Summer Institute

In general the teachers fel that there were two advantages

to the traditional summer institute program. First, there was the opportunity to use German constantly in somewhat natural situations and also for course instruction which was possible only to a limited degree in the commuter-type of institute. Secondly, one was able to put more concerted, concentrated effort forth in the intensive summer program. It was felt, however, that this advantage was somewhat offset by the inability to apply new ideas immediately in a regular classroom situation. The advantages of the commuter institute were cited as follows:

1. There was the opportunity to try the ideas and techniques developed during the institute under genuine classroom conditions in the actual teaching situation for which the participants were being paid by the local school board; and, along with this, there was the opportunity to get feedback from other participants who had tried the same technique.
2. The commuter institute appeared to set up a colleague relationship between staff members, and the cooperating teachers and college methods teachers who were participants in the institute. It was felt that the stresses and strains which developed through close contact in the intensive summer program were minimized in the commuter institute. This better relationship between faculty and participants produced a much better learning climate in the opinion of all participants. The participants were asked if given the choice between the two types of institutes in future years which they would choose. All felt that they would choose the commuter-type of institute.

Suggestions for Improvement

The interviews and the use of the Critical Incident Technique produced many suggestions for improvement of future institutes modeled after the Minnesota project. Among the areas for improvement were the following:

1. There should be more lectures conducted in German and more work carried on by means of the German language;
2. The effectiveness of the institute would be somewhat improved by adding a permanent media production center. Participants felt that the necessity to set up equipment for production of materials every week was wasteful of time and was an imposition upon the institute staff members. It would have been much better had camera stands, copy machines, tape dubbing equipment, tape recording rooms, and facilities for making overhead projectuals, etc. been readily available in a permanent location. (Participants were quick to add that the institute staff had done a commendable job in providing the needed equipment);
3. Somewhat more flexibility might have been built into the Saturday sessions so that when a given topic had stimulated conversation and activity other scheduled activities might have been done away with occasionally to allow participants to profit from the momentum which had been built up in the early meetings. In this regard it was noted that after five days of classroom teaching it was somewhat difficult immediately on Saturday morning to fall into the proper psychological set for the institute activities;
4. All institute participants were quite emphatic in saying that there should be no outside visitors from other university programs. These people, it was felt, greatly inhibited the responses of the participants and dampened what otherwise would have been a lively discussion of the morning's topic. (This remark was directed particularly to the sessions with outside speakers and consultants.) It was suggested that such persons either meet separately with other groups in the university or else that their presentations be video-taped for presentation to other groups;

5. As for the selection of people to talk to the group as consultants or speakers, it was suggested that more involvement from foreign language specialists at the college level who were not involved in teacher education directly but who were involved in decisions about the university or college curriculum should be present for discussion and interrogation. It was also suggested that people from general education (i.e., from educational psychology, curriculum and instruction, etc.) also appear to discuss problems with institute participants. When outside speakers were to come in, it was felt that readings relating to the speaker's topic should be mailed out in advance. This pattern was followed in some cases and was considered to be ideal;
6. Inasmuch as many people had to commute from rather long distances, it was felt that the commuter-type institute should start no earlier than 9:00 a.m.;
7. It was felt that the staff of such institutes should be alerted to the fact that considerable conflict exists in the commuter-type institute between the responsibility which the cooperating teacher feels to his high school students and the responsibility which he feels to completion of the institute work. Assignment at the institute should be adjusted accordingly;
8. A post-institute session in the summer following the completion of the institute (three to five days in length) was considered desirable by all participants;
9. All participants were inclined to preface their suggestions for improvement by saying that they were not being critical; they all felt strongly that, should funds be available, this concept of inservice training should definitely be continued. They were very strong in advocating the retention of the mix of college and high school teachers. They felt it would be a mistake to limit participation exclusively to methods teachers or to high school teachers.

10. Some of the high school teachers were of the opinion that there was a bit too much theoretical, abstract and inconclusive discussion which related solely to the definition of terms rather than to any practical application. Some felt that the terms should have been simply defined in advance by the staff in a rather arbitrary fashion thus leading to less "wheel spinning." Other problems cited were: "too much pressure to finish projects at the end of the institute, insufficient time to cover all of the items scheduled for the institute, and lack of followup of some of the stimulating presentations by visiting lecturers." Some of the high school teachers were somewhat disappointed in the failure of the group to define with precision the role of the cooperating teacher or to define what foreign language teaching actually consists of. (This was tied in with their criticism of "abstract theoretical discussions which led nowhere.) However, the college methods teachers tended to favor these discussions and to think that they were very profitable and useful. This, of course, is not surprising inasmuch as college methods teachers are frequently involved in discussions about the pedagogy of foreign language instruction whereas the high school teacher is directly involved in the practical problems of instruction within the present-day secondary school.

The Strengths of the Commuter-Type Institute

It was evident from the interviews, observations, and data collection procedures that the overall impact of the institute had been exceptionally profitable for all concerned. This evaluator has been involved in institute programs since 1960 in various roles (e.g., participant, instructor, evaluator, proposal writer, and member of approval boards for the funding of institutes

across the nation). Throughout this ten-year period this evaluator has never seen an institute group with a comparably level of esprit de corps. By the time of the observation the staff and participants had developed into a tightly-knit social unit capable of animated discussion, vehement disagreement, and cooperative effort toward fulfillment of the institute goals. The interviews were held in the absence of the institute staff. All data collected was done without participant signatures and with the understanding that no staff member would see their handwritten evaluations. Thus, any direct or indirect influence from the institute staff was minimized. Nevertheless, all participants were elaborate in their praise of the staff members and of the administration and organization of the institute. The high school members of the institute were particularly appreciative of being treated like colleagues rather than like students. Observation of the institute activities clearly tended to substantiate these claims. Participants were uninhibited in their discussions, were willing to challenge anyone on anythin, and, though the discussions were generally serious and often philosophical, the mood was always good-natured even during periods of heated discussion. Thus, it is not surprising that, on the Critical Incident Evaluation, participants most often cited "the exchange of ideas in a relaxed social environment" as the greatest strength of the institute program. Almost of equal frequency, however, (as the greatest strength of the institute) was the listing of practical, usable outcomes (e.g., the development of audio-visual materials for the classroom, the development of techniques relating to the supervision of teacher trainees, and the development of performance criteria for teacher trainees). Two people saw the development of a better role definition (for their role as cooperating teachers) as the greatest strength of the institute.

Development of Materials for Classroom Use

In conclusion, it is perhaps appropriate to mention the instructional materials which were developed in the course of the institute as "projects" to be completed by the participants. The evaluator had an opportunity to view a demonstration of materials which four of the participants had developed. These were complete units of work dealing with the teaching of some aspect of German instruction (e.g., the teaching of a given structure, set of lexical items, cultural concept, etc.) All of the units involved printed instructions for the student and included the use of at least one type of audio-visual equipment. One was truly a multi-media presentation involving the use of printed scripts, overhead projectuals with overlays, tape recordings, and color slides. The plans of the institute included a distribution of the 14 projects to each of the participants. The project phase of the institute had multiple values. First, each project served as a basis for further discussion (including suggestions for future improvement of the type of unit which was presented during a given demonstration period). Secondly, each project represented a unique approach to a different aspect of German instruction; this supplied each participant with 13 specific new ideas pertaining to German teaching. And finally, each participant was supplied with 14 sets of instructional materials in German, many of which could be adapted for subsequent use with the teacher's own students in the local educational agency. (In the present educational world which is emphasizing individualized instruction, the use of newer media, flexible scheduling, and large-group presentations, the value of possessing the type of materials described above is self evident.)

Summary

In the opinion of this evaluator, the institute described in this report is exemplary. With a few minor adjustments in

format, it could well become the model for restructuring in-service and preservice education for foreign language teachers in the schools of America. It has successfully bridged the gap between teachers in secondary and higher education, it has helped to define more clearly the role of the cooperating teacher, it has helped to make the work of the practice teacher more productive, it has supplied a wealth of new ideas to those who are engaged in the preservice education of foreign language teachers, and, in the process, it has improved instruction in ongoing high school programs and has encouraged teachers in those programs to assert themselves more forcefully as local and regional educational leaders. And finally, unlike many of the institute formats of the past, this project functioned smoothly within the ongoing programs of the various high schools, colleges, and universities from which the staff and participants were drawn. That is, it was not like many of the more ephemeral institute programs of years past which appeared in the summer with a great flurry of activity only to vanish without a trace when classes were scheduled in the fall. This compatibility with the established program - along with its many other virtues - make this institute worthy of emulation and replication.

APPENDIX G

Directions

The purpose of this instrument is to find out how you feel the Institute achieved its stated objectives. Please make your judgments on the basis of your own personal reaction to the Institute. On each of the pages following these directions you will find a statement that contains individual objectives and beneath it a set of scales. You are to rate the Institute on each of these scales in order. Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the Institute's accomplishments concerning an objective are very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair__X__:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ unfair

OR

fair_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:__X__ unfair

If you feel that these accomplishments are <u>quite closely related</u> to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check-mark as follows:

strong _____:__X__:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ weak

OR

strong _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:__X__:_____ weak

If the Institute's accomplishments in terms of an individual objective seem <u>only slightly related</u> to one side as opposed to the other side (but really neutral), then you should check as follows:

active _____:_____:__X__:_____:_____:_____:_____ passive

OR

active _____:_____:_____:_____:__X__:_____:_____ passive

The direction toward which you check depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the Institute's accomplishments for an objective.

If you consider the Institute's accomplishments for an objective to be neutral on the scale and both sides of the scale equally associated with these accomplishments, or if the scale has nothing at all to do with these accomplishments, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space:

safe _____:_____:_____:__X__:_____:_____:_____ dangerous

IMPORTANT

(1) Place your check-marks in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries:

THIS				NOT THIS
__X__	:	_____	:	_____X_____

(2) Be sure you check every scale - do not omit any.

(3) Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.

Sometimes you may feel as though an item has been repeated. This is not the case, so do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the test. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impression, the immediate "feeling" about the items, that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless, we want you to be frank in your judgment.

1. Did the Institute provide an up-grading of language skills?

1.	good	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ bad
2.	incomplete	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ complete
3.	kind	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ cruel
4.	dislike	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ kind
5.	skillful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ bungling
6.	uncomfortable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ comfortable
7.	successful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ unsuccessful
8.	meaningless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ meaningful
91	useful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ useless
10.	repels	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ attracts
11.	right	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ wrong
12.	negative	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ positive
13.	wise	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ foolish
14.	not-motivating	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ motivating
15.	simple	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ complex
16.	careless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ careful
17.	new	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ old
18.	colorless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ colorful
19.	interesting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ uninteresting
20.	unorganized	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ organized
21.	sophisticated	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ naive
22.	subjective	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ objective
23.	clear	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ confusing
24.	boring	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ exciting
25.	purposeful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ aimless

2. Did the Institute change your attitudes positively / negatively [circle one] toward teacher training?

1.	good	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	bad
2.	incomplete	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	complete
3.	kind	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	cruel
4.	dislike	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	like
5.	skillful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	bungling
6.	uncomfortable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	comfortable
7.	successful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unsuccessful
8.	meaningless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	meaningful
9.	useful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	useless
10.	repels	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	attracts
11.	right	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	wrong
12.	negative	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	positive
13.	wise	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	foolish
14.	not-motivating	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	motivating
15.	simple	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	complex
16.	careless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	careful
17.	new	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	old
18.	colorless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	colorful
19.	interesting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	uninteresting
20.	unorganized	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	organized
21.	sophisticated	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	naive
22.	subjective	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	objective
23.	clear	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	confusing
24.	boring	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	exciting
25.	purposeful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	aimless

3. Did the Institute change your attitude positively / negatively [circle one] toward your role in teacher education?

1.	good	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bad
2.	incomplete	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	complete
3.	kind	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	cruel
4.	dislike	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	like
5.	skill ful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bungling
6.	uncomfortable	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	comfortable
7.	successful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	unsuccessful
8.	meaningless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	meaningful
9.	useful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	useless
10.	repels	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	attracts
11.	right	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	wrong
12.	negative	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	positive
13.	wise	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	foolish
14.	not-motivating	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	motivating
15.	simple	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	complex
16.	careless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	careful
17.	new	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	old
18.	colorless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	colorful
19.	interesting	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	uninteresting
20.	unorganized	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	organized
21.	sophisticated	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	naive
22.	subjective	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	objective
23.	clear	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	confusing
24.	boring	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	exciting
25.	purposeful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	aimless

4. Did the Institute provide an atmosphere where the University and Secondary School people could together plan for changes in teacher education?

1.	good	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bad
2.	incomplete	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	complete
3.	kind	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	cruel
4.	dislike	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	like
5.	skillful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bungling
6.	uncomfortable	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	comfortable
7.	successful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	unsuccessful
8.	meaningless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	meaningful
9.	useful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	useless
10.	repels	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	attracts
11.	right	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	wrong
12.	negative	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	positive
13.	wise	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	foolish
14.	not-motivating	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	motivating
15.	simple	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	complex
16.	careless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	careful
17.	new	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	old
18.	colorless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	colorful
19.	interesting	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	uninteresting
20.	unorganized	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	organized
21.	sophisticated	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	naive
22.	subjective	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	objective
23.	clear	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	confusing
24.	boring	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	exciting
25.	purposeful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	aimless

5. For those who worked with the University of Minnesota, did the Institute have a positive / negative [circle one] impact on the FL teacher education program?

1.	good	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	bad
2.	incomplete	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	complete
3.	kind	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	cruel
4.	dislike	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	like
5.	skillful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	bungling
6.	uncomfortable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	comfortable
7.	successful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unsuccessful
8.	meaningless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	meaningful
9.	useful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	useless
10.	repels	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	attracts
11.	right	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	wrong
12.	negative	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	positive
13.	wise	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	foolish
14.	not-motivating	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	motivating
15.	simple	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	complex
16.	careless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	careful
17.	new	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	old
18.	colorless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	colorful
19.	interesting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	uninteresting
20.	unorganized	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	organized
21.	sophisticated	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	naive
22.	subjective	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	objective
23.	clear	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	confusing
24.	boring	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	exciting
25.	purposeful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	aimless

6. For those who are cooperating teachers, did the Institute contribute in a positive / negative [circle one] way in your role as a cooperating teacher?

1.	good	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bad
2.	incomplete	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	complete
3.	kind	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	cruel
4.	dislike	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	like
5.	skillful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bungling
6.	uncomfortable	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	comfortable
7.	successful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	unsuccessful
8.	meaningless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	meaningful
9.	useful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	useless
10.	repels	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	attracts
11.	right	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	wrong
12.	negative	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	positive
13.	wise	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	foolish
14.	not-motivating	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	motivating
15.	simple	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	complex
16.	careless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	careful
17.	new	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	old
18.	colorless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	colorful
19.	interesting	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	uninteresting
20.	unorganized	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	organized
21.	sophisticated	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	naive
22.	subjective	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	objective
23.	clear	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	confusing
24.	boring	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	exciting
25.	purposeful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	aimless

7. Did the Institute contribute to the development of "leadership" qualities in participants?

1.	good	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bad
2.	incomplete	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	complete
3.	kind	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	cruel
4.	dislike	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	like
5.	skillful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bungling
6.	uncomfortable	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	comfortable
7.	successful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	unsuccessful
8.	meaningless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	meaningful
9.	useful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	useless
10.	repels	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	attracts
11.	right	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	wrong
12.	negative	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	positive
13.	wise	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	foolish
14.	not-motivating	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	motivating
15.	simple	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	complex
16.	careless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	careful
17.	new	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	old
18.	colorless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	colorful
19.	interesting	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	uninteresting
20.	unorganized	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	organized
21.	sophisticated	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	naive
22.	subjective	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	objective
23.	clear	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	confusing
24.	boring	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	exciting
25.	purposeful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	aimless

8. Did the Institute provide help in areas of teaching which could be passed on to student teachers?

1.	good	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bad
2.	incomplete	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	complete
3.	kind	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	cruel
4.	dislike	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	like
5.	skillful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bungling
6.	uncomfortable	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	comfortable
7.	successful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	unsuccessful
8.	meaningless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	meaningful
9.	useful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	useless
10.	repels	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	attracts
11.	right	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	wrong
12.	negative	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	positive
13.	wise	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	foolish
14.	not-motivating	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	motivating
15.	simple	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	complex
16.	careless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	careful
17.	new	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	old
18.	colorless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	colorful
19.	interesting	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	uninteresting
20.	unorganized	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	organized
21.	sophisticated	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	naive
22.	subjective	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	objective
23.	clear	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	confusing
24.	boring	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	exciting
25.	purposeful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	aimless

9. Did the Institute obtain its overall objective?:

"The overall objective of this institute is to develop a model classroom teacher/college relationship which will give the classroom teacher an important place as a co-professional in planning foreign language teacher training programs and in carrying out his very important function as cooperating teacher in the student teaching program."

1.	good	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bad
2.	incomplete	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	complete
3.	kind	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	cruel
4.	dislike	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	like
5.	skillful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bungling
6.	uncomfortable	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	comfortable
7.	successful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	unsuccessful
8.	meaningless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	meaningful
9.	useful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	useless
10.	repels	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	attracts
11.	right	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	wrong
12.	negative	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	positive
13.	wise	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	foolish
14.	not-motivating	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	motivating
15.	simple	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	complex
16.	careless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	careful
17.	new	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	old
18.	colorless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	colorful
19.	interesting	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	uninteresting
20.	unorganized	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	organized
21.	sophisticated	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	naive
22.	subjective	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	objective
23.	clear	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	confusing
24.	boring	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	exciting
25.	purposeful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	aimless

10. For those who are teacher trainers, did the Institute provide positive / negative [circle one] stimuli which will be helpful in the further development of the program of FL teacher education in your own institution?

1.	good	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bad
2.	incomplete	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	complete
3.	kind	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	cruel
4.	dislike	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	like
5.	skillful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	bungling
6.	uncomfortable	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	comfortable
7.	successful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	unsuccessful
8.	meaningless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	meaningful
9.	useful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	useless
10.	repels	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	attracts
11.	right	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	wrong
12.	negative	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	positive
13.	wise	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	foolish
14.	not-motivating	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	motivating
15.	simple	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	complex
16.	careless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	careful
17.	new	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	old
18.	colorless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	colorful
19.	interesting	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	uninteresting
20.	unorganized	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	organized
21.	sophisticated	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	naive
22.	subjective	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	objective
23.	clear	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	confusing
24.	boring	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	exciting
25.	purposeful	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	aimless

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA EPDA INSTITUTE IN GERMAN

for

COOPERATING TEACHERS AND TEACHER TRAINERS

TWO WEEKS, AUGUST 11-22, 1969
and 18 Saturdays throughout the Academic Year 1969-70.

(Conducted under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education as authorized under the Education Professions Development Act.)

From August 11-22, 1969 the University of Minnesota in cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education will conduct a two week institute in German for cooperating teachers and teacher trainers with 18 follow-up sessions throughout the academic year 1969-70.

CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION

The institute is designed for 1) secondary school teachers who have supervised or who wish to supervise student teachers and for 2) trainers of teachers who wish to participate in a program dealing with the supervision of student teachers. The program is limited to applicants from within commuting distance to the University of Minnesota.

Secondary School Teachers

1. Major teaching responsibility in German
2. At least two years of teaching experience
3. Must be willing to supervise student teachers during the academic year 1969-70
4. Willingness to participate in all events of the institute
5. Letter of approval from the school principal allowing the participant to have student teachers throughout the academic year 1969-70
6. Evidence of employment for the following academic year
7. Letter by the applicant to accompany the application indicating his leadership role in teacher education for the future.

Teacher Trainers

1. Evidence of teaching a methods course or supervising student teachers
2. Evidence of employment for the following academic year.

This institution is in compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which states: Discrimination prohibited — Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore EPDA programs must be operated in compliance with this law.

DEADLINE FOR APPLICATIONS

Completed applications must be postmarked NO LATER than April 6, 1969. Notifications of selection will be sent to applicants on April 19. Letters of Acceptance from participants and alternates are to be postmarked no later than April 28, 1969.

GRADUATE CREDIT

Graduate credit will be given to participants who successfully complete the work of the Institute provided the participant is accepted by the Graduate School, 316 Johnston Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 before the opening of the institute.

PROGRAM OF THE INSTITUTE

Objectives

— To develop the awareness of the cooperating teacher regarding his special role in the training of foreign language teachers.
— To involve the cooperating teacher in actual planning and training of foreign language teachers.
— To provide an opportunity for cooperating teachers to continue to develop their understanding of curricular, methodological and language problems.
— To provide an opportunity for teacher trainers to explore patterns of supervision which may be usable in their own particular institutions.

Program

The institute program will consist of:

- A Practicum in Problems of Teaching — will include a broad discussion of teaching problems on all levels of instruction and will be linked to the undergraduate methods work of the participant's prospective student teachers.
- Supervision of instruction — will stress the cooperating teacher's role in the supervision of student teachers.
- The Foreign Language: German — will put stress on the cooperating teacher's own needs regarding his control of German, but will also be related to the cooperating teacher's role in improving the student-teacher's control of German, as well as to classroom students.
- Audio-Visual Aids Laboratory — will stress the cooperating teacher's use of equipment as a model for student-teachers, especially language laboratory and electronic classroom.
- Integrating Activities:
  - Special Program of Films and Video Tapes
  - Special Consultants
  - Individual Conferences
  - Small Group Discussion
  - Institute Seminar

During the two week program in August, classes will be held Monday-Friday from 8:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m. with 15 minute coffee breaks both morning and afternoon. Lunch will be from 11:30-12:30. During the 18 Saturday sessions, classes and breaks will be similar in duration.

STIPENDS

Applicants selected are eligible upon application to receive a weekly stipend of $75 plus an additional $15 per week for each dependent while attending the institute. The 18 Saturday sessions will be based on this same stipend.

FACILITIES AND MATERIALS AVAILABLE

All of the education facilities of a large university will be available. These include the general and special libraries, laboratory facilities, tape recordings and films.

STAFF

Dale L. Lange, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Foreign Language Education. Director. *Practicum* and *Supervision.*

Jermaine D. Arendt, Ph.D., Foreign Language Consultant, Minneapolis Public Schools. *Practicum* and *Audio-Visual Lab.*

Gene L. Anderson, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Clinical Experiences. *Supervision.*

Percy Fearing, M.A., Foreign Language Consultant, Minnesota State Department of Education. *Supervision* and *Practicum.*

Mark Goodman, M.A., A-V Resource Teacher, Minneapolis Public Schools. *Audio-Visual Lab.*

German Language Specialist — Yet to be named.

PLEASE DETACH AND RETURN

REQUEST FOR APPLICATION FORMS:

FOR APPLICATION FORMS, PLEASE DETACH AND MAIL IMMEDIATELY.
COMPLETED APPLICATION FORMS MUST BE POSTMARKED
BY APRIL 6, 1969

To:

Dale L. Lange
EPDA Institute for Cooperating Teachers and Teacher Trainers
152-A Peik Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455